

RFP DGS-2053: CALNET II
BIDDERS CONFERENCE
DECEMBER 2, 2004
10:00 a.m. – Noon
707 Third Street, Auditorium
West Sacramento, CA

SUMMARY

Note: The information provided below is a summary of the information exchanged at the Bidders Conference and is not intended to be a verbatim transcript.

Panel:

Barry Hemphill, Department of General Services (DGS), Telecommunications Division (TD)
Ila Parisek, Department of General Services (DGS), Procurement Division (PD)
Cathy Brown, Department of General Services (DGS), Procurement Division (PD)

I. Welcome and Opening Comments – Ila Parisek, DGS/PD

- Introduced speakers (Barry Hemphill, Deputy Director DGS/TD and Cathy Brown, DGS/PD).
- Reminded attendees to sign-in and leave business cards.
- Advised that a conference summary will be posted on the CALNET II website.
- Emphasized subscribing to the CALNET II website at <http://www.td.dgs.ca.gov/Services/ONS/CALNETIIHomepage.htm>
- Identified her role as the Procurement Official and Single Point of Contact, and that questions should be submitted via e-mail to her at ila.parisek@dgs.ca.gov.
- The State is working diligently to respond to questions submitted prior to the Bidders Conference.
- Attendees were asked to submit complex technical questions in writing to ensure an accurate understanding and response.

II. Bid Process Overview – Ila Parisek, DGS/PD

- This is a competitive bid for statewide services that will be awarded to a single prime contractor.
- The successful bidder must be authorized by CPUC to provide telecom services in California.
- The RFP requirements include a transparent transition at no cost to the State or local government customers.

- The resulting contract will include a 5-year term with 2 optional 1-year extensions with an estimated value of \$300 million in revenue per year, although there is no guaranteed participation level.
- Emphasized that the RFP includes the need to satisfy Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) requirements or a good faith effort (required by law) and bidders could be disqualified if these requirements are not met.
- California State Contracts Register allows bidders to attach advertisements that provides a good opportunity to find qualified DVBEs.
- Stressed the importance of reading the RFP thoroughly.
- Stressed the importance of paying close attention to the Key Action Dates. Submittals must arrive on or before the dates required.
- RFP Section 1 outlines the requirements for pre-qualification submittal with nondisclosure agreements, each company's financial statements, Letter of Intent to Bid, and other documentation. There will be no disqualification process at this point in the process. The purpose is to identify the bidders and maintain contact with them throughout the bid process.
- Requests for contract language changes must be submitted by the due date in the Key Action Dates. Contract language changes will be made when they are in the best interest of the State.
- This RFP process includes the submission of preliminary proposals in the form of conceptual and detailed technical proposals. This process allows the bidders an opportunity to provide the concepts they intend to propose and the technical solution that supports those concepts. Bidders are provided feedback from the State on the conceptual and technical proposals during confidential discussions. The State will not score these proposals, but will evaluate them for compliance with the technical requirements. This process is for the benefit of the bidders and to ensure the bidders meet the RFP requirements.
- A draft proposal process follows the conceptual and detailed technical proposals. The draft proposal process provides an opportunity for the bidders to submit all the documentation (with the exception of pricing) for evaluation and compliance with the RFP requirements. The evaluation team will try to identify areas where each bid may, or may not, be compliant - again providing feedback through confidential discussions.
- Draft and Final Proposals require 4 volumes. Volume 1 includes a cover letter, table of contents, executive summary and the bidder's response to the RFP requirements. Volume 2 includes any literature that supports the bidder's proposal. Volume 3 shall be sealed separately and will contain the bidder's pricing information. Volume 4 includes the completed contract. Bidders were advised not to modify the contract language unless the State has approved such changes or the bid could be disqualified.

- Final proposals will be evaluated and scored in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 9 of the RFP. Bidders should pay close attention to the evaluation criteria. Final proposals will be evaluated and scored prior to the cost opening. The State emphasized that Volume 3 – Costs shall be sealed separately. Bids received without Volume 3 sealed separately will be disqualified. Bidders should not include any pricing in the conceptual, technical, or draft proposals as this could be grounds for disqualification as well.
- The cost opening will be in a public forum. The State will provide the evaluation scoring for each bidder, open the Volume 3 Costs submitted by each of the compliant bidders, and announce each bidder's proposed costs based on the cost model in the RFP.
- Once the costs are opened, the State will validate each bid for mathematical errors and make a selection based on the evaluation criteria and issue a Letter of Intent to Award.
- As a point of clarification, bidders may submit written questions up to the final proposal submission date.

III. CALNET II –Barry Hemphill

- Discussed the CALNET II RFP from a high level perspective. Encouraged bidders to read Section 1 of the RFP that describes the State's direction with this RFP and some background information. The CALNET II RFP will result in a contract to replace the current contract for telecommunications services known as CALNET I at the end of the current contract period in December, 2005. The RFP describes the State's requirements for the telecommunications services. The CALNET II contract will also act as the vehicle local government may use to acquire telecommunications services. The RFP will be a services contract, not an equipment contract. The State will procure services as defined in the RFP. Statements made at the Bidders Conference were for information only. Answers and statements from the State become official only when they are in writing.
- The CALNET II approach will be an award to a single prime contractor with subcontractors. This is a cost effective solution for a whole host of reasons. We anticipate that it will leverage the State's purchasing power, take advantage of economies of scale, and consequentially lower prices overall for the State of California and any other entities that use the contract. The State is seeking a prime contractor and understands that partnership arrangements may be required. CALNET II will continue to support most of the services that are currently in CALNET I, however, it is up to the bidders to provide the method of delivery. The State's intent was to describe the required functionality, not the method of delivery.
- New technology, if it comes on the horizon, will be acquired via a separate bid. An example is using electrical transmission lines to transmit information both for voice and data. If that occurred, it would be up to DGS to acquire these services following State policy and guidelines if it were determined to be in the best

interest of the State, and it would be a separate contract from the CALNET II contract. Technology that is not already on the CALNET II contract, or that cannot be defined as an enhancement, cannot be added.

- The CALNET II contract term is 5 years with 2 additional one-year extensions.
- Regarding questions and answers: Over 500 questions had been asked and the State is working to answer them as quickly and as accurately possible. The Bidders Conference was optional and serves as a forum for bidders to clarify the CALNET II RFP requirements and/or processes. It was not intended to provide a forum for a discussion of the State's strategic directions to acquire communication services. Bidders have been, and continue to be, encouraged to submit their technical and detailed questions in writing to the Procurement Officer.

BIDDER'S QUESTIONS

NOTE: Answers here may be modified from the statements made in the bidders conference for clarification and accuracy purposes. In the event a suitable answer was provided as a response to a written question, readers will be referred to the appropriate Q&A Set and specific question/response.

1. You indicated in your comments as new technology comes along it may be a separate bid. Unless I miss-read what is already in the RFP, are you sticking with ancient technology rather than new technology which allow convergence that would offer significant savings to the state? In reading the RFP, it appears that you're predisposed to continuing with technology that is currently in place. Is that your intent?

Answer: The State has tried to not lock into any particular direction. The State believes the marketplace will provide the best solution through the competitive process. The winning bidder will need to support the existing services/features that are in place until the various agencies are ready to move to other technologies. [See also, General Response to Question and Answer Set #2, dated October 24, 2004 and response to question #7 below.]

2. Following up to the last question and one of the responses published on the website: Where the confusion is coming from is if the State is interested in new technology, it appears that the RFP is structured on current technology. Those of us who are thinking about a converged environment don't know how to respond within the RFP format so that the State understands what we're bidding and how you can evaluate it within the current structure of the RFP.

Answer: The RFP indicates features and functionality to be provided. The choice of technology and method of delivery is up to the prime contractor. [Also, see responses to questions 7, 22, 24, and 25 below. Bidders are

advised that “technology”, as we use it, is not interchangeable with “end-user features and functionality”.]

3. I understand what you’re saying, and I have read all the questions and all the answers. I’m having difficulty understanding how we would put it in a format that would be evaluated in the current structure of the RFP because it appears that the RFP is specifying technology and then the evaluation of that technology and that’s what we’re struggling with.

Answer: This should be addressed during the confidential bidder’s discussion. There is also an opportunity in the bid process to request changes to the RFP if you have concerns about the format of the RFP.

4. Regarding competition and multiple vendors versus using one contractor: The question goes back to the original legislation that set up CALNET I and it’s baby being CALNET II - thereafter making sure that there are multiple vendors that have the capability to compete - the term that they used was feasible. As long as it’s feasible, it can be done. It seems that we’re going back to a general contractor and allowing the contractors to make the decision on who they believe is most competitive. What analysis has been done to confirm that this is not feasible to go to a multiple vendor process?

Answer: The State has chosen a single contractor model based on customer and market research, its own experience, and because it believes it is cost effective and leverages the purchasing power of the State. [See also, General Response to Q&A Set #2, dated November 24, 2004 and Question and Answer Set #10, responses to questions 1-1 and 1-2.]

5. How do you envision the general contractor choosing subcontractors and what method would you use to determine that there is true competition rather than a strategic alliance for the best price and best product? What analysis would be used?

Answer: The State intends to award to a single prime contractor based on the evaluation criteria in the RFP. It is up to the prime contractor to choose the subcontractors consistent with the requirements of the RFP.

6. The original legislation pushed and emphatically used the standard of “wherever feasible use multiple vendors.” That legislation encouraged analysis be done on competition and that DGS make sure that there’s competition. The question that we’re posing is: How is the intent and spirit of the legislature being complied with?

Answer: Without a reference to a specific citation, we can’t comment on the legislation mentioned. However, the State has done its analysis and maintains the ability, flexibility, and duty to determine what services are

appropriate and how it will acquire those services including the resulting contract's content, structure and award methodology. The State already awards multiple technology contracts, which allows for competition from multiple bidders, and ultimately a variety of awarded contractors. It does not necessarily follow that a specific contract (such as CALNET) is required to have multiple awarded contractors. There are many ways to generate competition and to utilize multiple vendors.

7. A follow-up question about newer services. An example is Centrex services. There are a lot of newer technologies out there that could very well replace Centrex services for a much lower cost. If we wanted to bid a different type of service than Centrex service, how would we go about that? Wouldn't we actually take the Centrex sections and replace them with what we want to bid? Does it need to be bid in a separate section? That question applies to a lot of the services. How do we go about bidding new services specifically as a response to the RFP? Would we need to do it in the context of that RFP section and state that "this is in replacement of that service" or would we need to do it in a separate section? Could you comment on how that would work?

Answer: The RFP does not specifically state what type of technology bidders can offer in their proposals, but it includes the features and functionality the State has today. Bidders may offer any solution that provides equivalent functionality as described in the RFP and that the State determines meets its needs. If there is a technology that can provide the functionality defined in the RFP, the bidder should provide that information in the conceptual proposal. However, the State will not accept an initial statewide deployment of VoIP. For further explanation, see RFP Section 1.2.5.

8. Could you make a general comment on why wireless service is not included in the RFP? Specifically, remote tele-workers, which is a big push for the State, and campus wireless LAN, which is an opportunity to replace the very expensive Centrex service today.

Answer: DGS/TD is working with a few departments on wide scale wireless pilot programs at this point and may pursue a separate wireless contract at a later date. The State's intent in CALNET II is to procure equivalent features and functionality that are available under CALNET I that the State determines meets its needs.

9. With all due respect, I'm a little bit confused about the State's position because there was an attempt to have a 2 year extension for the CALNET contract pushed through and that failed because there was a recognition that there are a lot of new services out there that the State of California needs to take advantage of.

Answer: The reason the CALNET I contract was not extended was for business reasons that did not involve technology.

10. The new contract is supposed to be non-exclusive with no minimum guarantees for the contractor for revenues and services ordered. Most services will not be subject to term commitments. How is that supposed to drive the competitive aspect of this contract? What does that mean? Could you provide an example?

Answer: The intent of the non-exclusivity clause is that if it is more cost effective for the State to purchase a contract service elsewhere, then the State may pursue purchasing that service from another source. Example: if a contracted service could be replaced with a 20% savings to the State and the State determines the offering has equivalent functionality - the State could decide to transition to the new offering on a case-by-case or statewide basis. [See also Appendix B, Section 56 Non-Exclusive Agreement and Question and Answer Set#2, response to question #38.]

11. What's the process to have that happen?

Answer: Agency requests for exemption are evaluated based on a variety of equivalency factors as outlined in the MM 04-08 exemption process.

12. Is it your intention that non-exclusivity is supposed to drive the competitive aspects of this RFP, even in a single vendor environment?

Answer: The State expects to be offered competitive solutions for the life of the CALNET II contract. If the State determines that other vendors are offering equivalent or better services with similar support (i.e., single point of contact for provisioning and outage restoral, monitoring tools, and trending reports) and quality of service (i.e., SLAs, diversity, and survivability) at a significantly (20% or more) reduced price, the State may decide to permit an exemption. [Also, see Q&A Set #2, question 1-38. and Appendix B, Section 56 Non-Exclusive Agreement.]

13. You mentioned that PBX technology might be a possibility. Historically speaking, DGS Telecom has been reticent to accept PBX technology. Has that changed?

Answer: Any solution that is less expensive, functionally equivalent to the RFP requirements as determined by the State, and is provided with no transition costs to the State is acceptable to offer.

14. We're still unclear from an infrastructure and response standpoint. How does a bidder propose a PBX solution given the parameters of the existing documentation?

Answer: During the confidential bidders conferences following review of the conceptual proposals, specific details of the RFP format can be discussed. Additionally, bidders can submit recommended changes to the RFP in accordance with RFP section 2.2.7.

15. You stated earlier that the State does not want to say how to provide the solution/services rather give the requirements. Can we acknowledge the State's requirements in the RFP are functional and be creative in providing a solution to meet your functional requirements?

Answer: Yes. The State encourages bidders to be creative with their solutions within the parameters set by the RFP. [See also responses to #2 and #14 above.]

16. It appears that the RFP is really written in an RFQ format where the State's dictating the services. The evaluation criteria and the cost pricing sheets are all built around services as opposed to functionality.

Answer: It is the State's intent in the RFP to describe the features and functionality required. Bidders are encouraged to exercise the process for recommending changes as described in RFP Section 2.2.7 if unable to determine a way to adequately structure pricing.

17. Can we discuss strategic direction in confidential discussions?

Answer: Yes. The RFP addresses the State's strategic direction and this issue can be discussed further in the confidential discussions.

18. If there are changes that are made based upon the questions to the RFP, will the time frame also be pushed out so that we will have time to react to what the changes are?

Answer: That depends on the changes being requested. If the changes impact the bidders' ability to respond to the State's requirement, then the State may consider moving dates. [Subsequent to the Bidders Conference, some Key Action Dates were pushed out.]

19. In the event an exemption is granted, is DGS going to make available some kind of purchasing vehicle? Now there is no purchasing vehicle available for telecommunications. What type of purchasing vehicle would be available for them to use?

Answer: Agencies would have to solicit bids for the services themselves unless a Master Services Agreement or other contract vehicle exists or is subsequently bid.

20. Are you going to competitively bid new technologies or other technologies that the State isn't procuring today as opposed to just amending the contract?

Answer: Enhancements of a service already on the CALNET II contract may be added through an amendment to the contract. New services (like an electric transmission line for transmitting communications service) would be bid separately and cannot be added by a contract amendment.

21. It seems apparent from all the questions that the technical requirements and the evaluation requirements are tied together 1 for 1. If we propose an alternate technology for any of the components in section 6, we can't understand how you could win in the end with the evaluation criteria. Again, how would you address this with any other technologies other than those listed?

Answer: This subject needs to be addressed in the confidential discussions.

22. If we're to propose replacing the copper infrastructure with wireless, there really isn't a place in the RFP that would say we'd like a solution for this. It's already predefined. How do you get past that? Do you rewrite the whole section 6 yourself? And start from scratch? How would you go about it if you had a converged environment or an alternate solution? Because they're all listed specifically by line side and network. They're all predefined as the contract lists today. We don't know how to get past that point to submit something workable for you.

Answer: A bidder's conceptual proposal should detail how they intend to meet the technical requirements in another fashion. The State must do its own due diligence in the examination of all conceptual proposals. The clearer a conceptual proposal communicates the proposed solution - the easier it will be for the State to make an informed decision as to the appropriateness of the solution. This will allow the State to determine whether to revise the requirements. It will still allow for full competition with this procurement.

23. In the conceptual proposal, we would basically ignore the evaluation criteria as it sits and propose something that our own criteria might add up to a whole different way and see if it changes?

Answer: Conceptual proposals do not include a response to the evaluation. Perceived conflicts between the requirements and the evaluation criteria may be discussed during the confidential discussion.

24. Our design typically is developed for each customer. We look at each individual and our own chance of winning. Considering the evaluation criteria, how do we add up to get a winning set of points? If I add it all up and we can't come to that

answer, basically, it wouldn't make business sense to go forward. So we couldn't use your evaluation criteria as a guideline on how to do a design.

Answer: Each bidder will decide how close to tie its solution to the evaluation. If a bidder believes that the evaluation criteria does not represent the RFP requirements, a request to change the requirements may be submitted as described in RFP Section 2.2.7. This may also be discussed further in the confidential discussions.

25. What you just said is that you did actually make the conscious decision to list the specific technologies that should be bid. By saying "if we have an alternative, we'll entertain it and go back." But you made a conscious decision on which technologies you want to use. And it didn't specifically say in the RFP that if you had functional capabilities that are the same, go ahead and bid those.

Answer: The State's business needs are described in the RFP. If a bidder believes that there is another way to satisfy these needs, and that solution can be documented, then the bidder should provide that information in their response so the State can evaluate that proposal to determine if it satisfies the RFP requirements. See also answers to #7, 21, and 24 above.

26. Are you predisposed to the technologies that are there and you have to have a compelling argument to change it? Because if you're predisposed to those and they are wired directly to the points that you get, we don't understand how you're going to evaluate these other technologies.

Answer: Without the benefit of proposed changes to specific RFP language and without reviewing conceptual proposals, the State cannot comment on how it would revise the RFP.

27. I've heard it 6 times now, asked different ways about the same thing: "How do we bid another technology and get it evaluated fairly based on the criteria that's currently laid out in the RFP?" I think that's really the question that everyone's trying to get answered. How do I propose another technology and have it fairly weighted?

Answer: See responses to questions #7, #21, #24, #25, and #26 above.

28. The way that the RFP is structured today, all of us are going to put together responses. We're estimating the administrative cost is somewhere around \$800K to \$1M to put together a response that's based on a specification that the State has provided. You're telling us all that functionally we can provide an alternative and you'll evaluate it sometime in the future. We're all trying to figure out if we should invest the money up front, try to make the modification you've suggested, hoping that you'll understand that the current structure of the

RFP doesn't meet what we're all talking here. That's the primary concern and so we think that the conceptual design discussion is too late in the process. We need to look at how we structurally change the RFP to allow the things that we've all been talking about. The response that you've been providing us is that we should be innovative, be creative, drive the cost down. The current structure doesn't allow that and we're all concerned about the cost to respond.

Answer: See responses to questions #7, #21, #24, #25, and #26 above. [Also, the State has since revised the Key Action Dates through addenda.]

29. In the bid process that you talked about earlier, are we going to be able to talk about savings in the RFP?

Answer: A bidder may make general cost savings statements, but they may not provide specific costs for services or features. As required by State law for sealed bid procurements, a bidder may not quote costs for services or for alternatives during the bid process except within the cost proposal, which is to be sealed separately.

30. If the telephone companies are going to provide new technology, you obviously want to know if it was going to save you money or if it was going to cost you more.

Answer: Yes, the State does want that information and it would be factored into the cost evaluation portion of the evaluation process. As stated in the RFP, costs are evaluated at 70% and technical responses at 30%. However, the specific costs may only be provided in the separately sealed Costs submittal.

31. If we wanted to voice our concern about the single source or the prime contractor requirement of the bid, would that be more in line with the "Last day to protest the RFP" date?

Answer: RFP Section 2.2.7 allows bidders to submit requests for change to the RFP requirements. If a definitive answer is not provided or if the bidder does not agree with the determination, then there is a process to challenge that determination, which ends with the Last Date to Protest the RFP Requirements.

32. That question has already been asked and answered and it's a one-word answer - "No". It's already out there.

Answer: The State's strategic direction to pursue a single vendor solution is detailed in the RFP as well as in the General Response to the Question and Answer Set #2.

33. The current Management Memo 04-08 really defines the exemption process that takes place today. Is that Management Memo still the ultimate structure that defines the exemption process just like today and would it provide for competition tomorrow?

Answer: The Management Memo is the current guideline of policy for how the State does business. The State anticipates issuing a subsequent management memo after the adoption of CALNET II, but the exemption process is not planned to change in any significant way.

34. It seems the Management Memo defines the criteria by which the technologies in the RFP are allowed to go. The Management Memo is very definitive about specifying only limited technology. The RFP follows through on that and it's the same thing with the exemption process. It's pretty clear under what criteria an exemption would take place. The general concern with the Management Memo with most of the bidder's here is how do we evaluate what's going to be exempt to go outside of this? What would be included in the exemption process and how would that process work? Could you help define the Management Memo criteria on exemption and how that fosters any competition as we go forward?

Answer: Management Memo 04-08 provides the rationale for State agencies to consider when evaluating options outside of the current CALNET contract. Management Memo 04-08 also describes the general direction, process, and opportunity to consider cost as criteria for making an exemption determination. It does not limit what services an exemption can be requested for, though an exemption is generally only needed for mandatory services as listed in MM 04-08. That list could change. MM 04-08 outlines the criteria the State evaluates to determine if an exemption is warranted. Competition is generated by vendors offering to provide equivalent service(s) at a lower price than the CALNET contractor. The State would evaluate that claim, and make the determination of whether an exemption should be granted for a new competitive bid on that service. It could be an individual service purchased for one agency, a statewide service, or something in-between.

35. Currently, if you submit changes to the contract, Procurement typically looks at the Management Memo and says that technology is outside the contract and can't be added. Why would it be any different tomorrow when we go through this process? Is something functionally changing?

Answer: See response to question #36 below.

36. We've looked at the definition of the technologies requested in the requirements section of the RFP and how we might propose alternate technologies. These alternatives will ultimately still go under the Management Memo, which

explicitly states what kind of technology we can use. We don't know how to get past that if your present alternate technology is still in conflict with the Management Memo. Where does this get resolved - to see how alternate environments can exist with the Management Memo before the RFP is put out?

Answer: Management Memo 04-08 was written to apply to the CALNET services currently offered. The State anticipates issuing a subsequent management memo after the adoption of CALNET II that will redefine mandatory services.

37. The Management Memo is now the criteria that you use for the exemption process - the 20% savings and the criteria associated with that. In Section 1 of the RFP, you reference the Management Memo as a guidance document. If that memo changes, we don't know what the new criteria will be. How can we competitively bid this?

Answer: Management Memo 04-08 reflects a point in time where the State set a guideline for competition and as presently written is the document in force, and that is what should be used. Any new memoranda regarding policy will be consistent with the strategic goals as stated in the RFP. [See also Appendix B, Section 56 Non-Exclusive Agreement.]

38. You talked about the input that you received. Why weren't there any discussions with the vendors early on? You asked for input to the RFI.

Answer: The RFI was the vendor's opportunity for input and the information submitted was reviewed and considered. Vendors should not participate directly in the development of requirements for a State of California RFP.

39. Certain location level detail (address information, bandwidth to certain city locations, federal government locations, all users of this contract) is crucial for us to develop a cost model and a network design advantageous for you. When can we expect that information to be provided?

Answer: The RFP includes points-of-presence without identifying specific locations. Once the State receives Letters of Intent to Bid and Non-disclosure Agreements, that information will be provided as soon as it is available.

41. If we submit our Intent to Bid early, will you provide that info early? Do you have the information already?

Answer: (1) No, the State will supply the appropriate information to everyone at the same time. (2) The State is gathering that information and it will be provided as soon as possible.

42. We're a small company in no position to be a primary bidder. Our goal is to assist a primary bidder in meeting the requirements of the State. You might know that smaller companies are on the cusp of leading edge technology that we believe can help. If the structure doesn't allow the bidding process to include those newer technologies, you are by that very nature excluding a large majority of small companies that can't invest their time in older technology. You want to entertain new technologies and I think that you've heard almost everyone here say the structure that you have doesn't permit it. We would be excluded because we focus on that new technology.

Response: The State encourages bidders to partner and include new technologies where feasible that can support the services required by the RFP.

43. We understand that, but we're still hearing that you're predisposed to specific technologies and you want to be convinced that there are others that are more viable.

Answer: As described in the response to #2 above, the RFP indicates features and functionality to be provided. The choice of technical solution and method of delivery is up to the prime contractor. [See also response to question #7 above.]

44. The issue is that there are only 1 or 2 companies that can be a prime. If they can provide all the services in the manner in which the RFP is requesting them, what would motivate them to partner?

Answer: The State anticipates that no single bidder will be capable of providing all the technologies and services on a statewide basis.

45. The State owns a fiber network downtown. In the RFI process you said you'd entertain leasing that fiber to the winning vendor but in the RFP you removed that offer. Why did you remove it and do you understand the potential substantial savings to the State?

Answer: Numerous conditions prevent use of the existing fiber including, but not limited to, current physical condition of the plant, substructure, components and termination environment.